



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,373	10/24/2005	Roy Adar	0004803USU/2279	3982
27623 7590 11/05/2009 OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CT 06901				
EXAMINER				
SKINNER, SHEWANA D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3689				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/509,373

Applicant(s)

ADAR ET AL.

Examiner

SHEWANA SKINNER

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51 and 54-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51 and 54-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is a Final Action in response to correspondence received in 7/17/2009. Claims 1, 9, 13, 15, 19, 25, 31, 33, 39, 44, 45, and 47 have been amended. Claims 2-6, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 26-27, 32, 34-38, 41-43, 46-, 48-49, and 52-53 have been cancelled. Claims 55-56 are new. Therefore, **Claims 1, 7, 9, 13, 15, 19, 24, 25, 28-31, 33, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51 and 54-56** have been considered below.

Response to Amendment

1. The 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claim 29 has been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim to be dependent upon claim 19 which satisfies the antecedent basis requirement.
2. The 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 1-32 has been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim and reciting that the devices are a telephone, fax etc which are each structural elements.
3. The 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of Claims 1-32 has been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim and reciting that the first capturing device consist of a telephone, fax etc which are each structural elements and not simply software and is therefore statutory.
4. The 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of Claims 33-54 has not been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim and reciting that the first capturing device consist of a telephone, fax etc which are each structural elements and not simply software. The device, although a machine, is used to capture a first interaction which could simply be a fax machine receiving a

fax. This is reasoned to be an insignificant extra solution activity and is insufficient to render the otherwise ineligible process claim as statutory.

5. The 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of Claim 1 has not been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim to recite a time synchronizing device, where synchronizing is defined as arranging events and per applicant's disclosure in para 47 the time synchronization module is designed to assist in the monitoring of the correct temporal sequence of events that occurred during the interaction, *Charnock* discloses right clicking on an icon to get the timestamp details of events occurring during, before and after interactions where a device inherent to the system would be used to create said output (col 8 lines 33-39).

6. The 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of Claim 1 has not been withdrawn in light of applicant's amending the claim to recite an at least one interaction playback device. *Charnock* discloses querying the system through the use of speech recognition which would display discussions (interactions) that are within the system where an auditory interface is commonly used to playback the data to the use, therefore *Charnock* comprises a playback device (col 31 lines 26-33).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per Applicant's argument in reference to Claim 1, applicant recites an apparatus comprising capturing devices for capturing interactions. *Charnock* discloses an information storage system that is used in conjunction with a computer network that accesses (comprises) email data stored on an email server and files stored on a voicemail server (col 3 lines 58-63), where an email

server and a telephone are both listed, by applicant, as capturing devices. Therefore, as recited in the claims, *Charnock* structurally anticipates the capturing devices. As per Applicant's second argument that *Charnock* relates to documents and not interactions, as per applicant's specification interactions are communications between parties where as referenced in *Charnock*, discussions are related communications and events for which electronic evidence exists or can be created which turns them into documents (col 3 lines 38-41). Therefore as reasoned, by Examiner discussions are functionally the same as interactions. As per Applicant's third argument that *Charnock* does not integrate the interactions on a unified interaction, the claim actually recites "an integration device to integrate the at least one first interaction with the at least one second interaction", where integration is defined as uniting or coordinating, *Charnock* discloses an indexing system and sociological engine that integrates and stores all the data captured and allows for said data to be queried and displayed using the visualization mechanism (col 3 lines 64-66) As per Applicant's fourth argument *Charnock* does disclose separate communication channels in that it discloses a computer network that accesses an email server and voicemail server(col 3 lines 61-62) multiple other communication channels (col 7 lines 35-45). Applicant's fifth and sixth arguments have been addressed in the Response to Amendment section of said Final Office Action. As per Applicant's seventh argument *Charnock* does disclose in Fig 6 and col 8 lines 19-32 where a transaction is associated with an interaction (phone call) and the details of each transaction are provided in a graph, therefore it would be inherent to have a device in order to produce such an association and subsequent graph. In addition, Examiner notes that Applicant's mention of financially related interactions, although, non-functional and carrying no patentable weight that would distinguish it from the prior art can

be addressed by the transaction noting a wire transfer amount (col 8 line 26) and the money trail graph (Fig 10). Subsequently, since Claims 9, 15, 24, 28, 30 and 31 depend from Claim 13 the rejection of those claims still stands.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per Applicant's argument in reference to Claim 15, applicant states in his argument that Charnock has a daemon that send outs status messages (col 7 lines 51-52) which Examiner reasons to function the same as the notification message-generating device that generates status messages. The fact that the message sent is an alert according to the results of the analysis simply data and is not relevant structurally to the function of the apparatus.

8. Examiner notes that Applicant provided an argument in reference to Claim 20, however said claim was cancelled, therefore, argument is moot.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per Applicant's argument in reference to Claim 33, *Charnock* discloses a method for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions associated with an at least one transaction, the method where, through the querying step the retrieving, synchronizing, associating, generating and playback steps are performed in present tense and therefore disclosed. The capturing of the interactions, integrating, recording, and logging, were performed in the past tense unlike the applicant's invention where said steps are performed in the present tense. However it is obvious that these steps had to have been performed in order for the data to be in the database and able to be queried and associated.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 7/17/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that the 35 USC 103 rejection of Claims 6-8,13,19,21-23,25-

27,29,30,39-41 and 43-48 should be withdrawn and claims made allowable due to the fact that Charnock is inoperative to disclose features of the independent claims and McDonough does not remedy singularly or in combination the deficiencies is not persuasive. Examiner has stated above how Charnock anticipates the independent claims, that applicant's arguments to the contrary are unpersuasive, and therefore the 103 rejection stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. **Claims 33, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 50, 51, 54 and 56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The machine-or-transformation test is a two-branched inquiry; an applicant may show that a process claim is statutory either by showing that his claim is tied to a particular machine, for example by identifying the machine or apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an

insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test. *In re Bilski*, slip opinion 2007-1130 (Fed. Cir. October 30, 2008).

Here, applicant's method steps fail the first prong of the new test because the tie to a particular machine is only in the step of the capturing the first transaction were said machine could be a fax and the step being receiving said fax. This is reasoned to be insignificant extra solution activities and is insufficient to render the otherwise ineligible process claim as statutory.

Further, applicant's method steps fail the second prong of the test because the claimed steps do not result in an article being transformed from one state to another. There is no transformation occurring in the claims for a physical object or substance or data that represents physical objects or substances.

The claims as recited are not tied to a particular machine and do not transform the numerical data inputted into a different state or thing. Therefore, the claims do not recite statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-? are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Charnock et al....

Charnock discloses the following as claimed:

Claim 1: Currently Amended) An apparatus for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions associated with at least one transaction, the apparatus comprising: an at least one first ~~interaction~~-media-type capturing device for capturing an at least one interaction (col 3 line 61 and Fig 1 #110); an at least one second ~~interaction~~-media-type capturing device for capturing an at least one second interaction (col 3 line 62 and Fig 1 #110); a time synchronizing device to synchronize the at least one first interaction captured by the at least one first media-type capturing device with the at least one second interaction captured by the at least one second media-type capturing device (col 6 lines 19-21 and col 8 lines 33-38); and an integration device to integrate the at least one first interaction with the at least one second interaction into an at least one integrated interaction (col 3 lines 64-66); an association device to associate the at least one integrated interaction with the at least one transaction (Fig 6 and col 8 lines 19-32); an at least one recording and logging device that stores the at least first interaction, the at least one second interaction (col 3 lines 60-64); an at least one interaction retrieval device that retrieves the at least one first interaction, the at least one second interaction, and the at least one integrated interaction recorded by the recording and logging device (col 3 lines 64-66); and an at least one interaction playback device to playback the at least one first interaction, the at least one second interaction or the at least one integrated interaction retrieved by the at least one interaction retrieval device (col 31 lines 26-33), wherein the at least one first interaction and the at least one second interaction are captured from separate communication channels (col 3 lines 61-62 and col 7 lines 35-45), and wherein said first media-type capturing device is selected from the group consisting

of: a telephone, a fax, an e-mail server, an analog video camera, a digital video camera, an analog audio microphone, and a digital audio microphone (col 3 lines 61-62)

Claim 9. (Currently Amended) The apparatus for claim 1 further comprising: a database for storing the at least one first interaction, and the at least one second interaction, and a database for storing meta-data to provide the ability to retrieve the at least one integrated interaction (Fig 1).

Claim 15. (Currently Amended) The apparatus for claim 1 further comprising a notification message-generating device for generating a notification message associated with the at least one first interaction or with the at least one second interaction or with the at least one integrated interaction, the notification message being associated with misconduct, dispute resolution, or with a request for playback. (col 7 lines 51-52).

Claim 24. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the at least one first interaction and at least one second interaction are associated with at least one transaction. (col 8 lines 39-40)

Claim 28. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the at least one first interaction, the at least one second interaction and the at least one integrated interaction represent an at least one interaction between at least two parties. (col 4 lines 62-63)

Claim 31. (Currently Amended) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the at least one first interaction or the at least one second interaction is an audio or video interaction or a data exchange or data capture interaction. (col 7 lines 38-40)

Claim 50. (Original) The method of claim 33 wherein the synchronizing of the at least one first interaction with the at least one second interaction is a time-based synchronizing process or is a sequential-based synchronizing process. (col 6 lines 28-32 and Examiner finds the type of

synchronizing process to be nonfunctional descriptive material not functionally involved in the steps recited. The actual step of synchronizing would be performed the same regardless of the type of process. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 491, 494, (Fed. Cir.1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1931 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

Claim 54.(Original) The method of claim 33 wherein the at least one first interaction and the at least one second interaction constitute a time-based sequence of events. (col 6 lines 19-31)

Claim 55. (New) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the at least one first interaction or the at least one second interaction constitute screen events occurring on a screen (col 7 lines 35 and 36, where each occur on a screen) Examiner finds used by a trader not relevant to the structure of the device and therefore not given patentable weight that would distinguish it from the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 7, 13, 19, 25, 29 and 30** and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Charnock* in view of *McDonough et al (US 6,115,693)*, hereinafter, "*McDonough*".

As per Claim 7, *Charnock* discloses an apparatus for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions (fig 1). However, it does not explicitly state a device for secured access as in the limitation.

McDonough, (col 6 lines 7-9), discloses providing a secured access device.

Therefore, from the teaching of *McDonough*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a secured access device when accessing the apparatus disclosed in *Charnock* to better control the security and privacy of the interactions.

As per Claims 13,19,29 and 30 *Charnock* discloses an apparatus for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions (fig 1) and a database (Fig 1) where the content is analyzed as to its importance (col 7 lines 21-22), participants are evaluated on their participation level (col 7 lines 13-23) that provides visual monitoring off line. However, it does not explicitly state a device for business analysis, a monitoring device surveillance device and analyzing interactions.

McDonough is a system that receives interactions (col 12 lines 45-54), and discloses the quality center with multiple devices (col 13 lines 1-3), analyzing the statistics and the customer feedback which are the interactions, an evaluations device, and a surveillance device (col 13 lines 7-9), providing notification (Col 13 lines 16-18 where the information being detected is "not structurally relevant to the apparatus), and the monitoring is performed in real-time (col 10 lines 10-11) whereby there is a device to automate the monitoring per the routing rules (col 7 lines 41-42).

Therefore, from the teaching of *McDonough*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide quality devices when accessing the apparatus disclosed in *Charnock* to better evaluate and effectively improve the interactions.

As per Claim 25, Examiner finds the type of secured access to not structurally relevant to the apparatus as recited and therefore not given patentable weight that would distinguish it over the prior art.

6. **Claim 33, 39, 40, 44, 45, 47, 51 and 56** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Charnock* in view of *McDonough*.

As per Claim 33, *Charnock* discloses a method for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions associated with an at least one transaction, the method where, through the querying step the retrieving, synchronizing, associating, generating and playback steps are performed in present tense and therefore disclosed. The capturing of the interactions, integrating, recording, and logging, were performed in the past tense unlike the applicant's invention where said steps are performed in the present tense.

However it is obvious that these steps had to have been performed in order for the data to be in the database and able to be queried and associated.

As per Claim 39, *Charnock* discloses a method for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions (fig 1) where parameters are set-up (Col 5 lines 8-16). However, it does not explicitly state the adaptive calibration stated in the limitation.

McDonough discloses an a Quality Center for a Virtual Sales and Service Center that is responsible for monitoring the customer experience and managing call center business operations where there is an ability to change parameters for routing and overflow rules. (col 13 lines 27-28)

Therefore, from the teaching of *McDonough*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to explicitly state that you can set-up and adaptively change the parameters on the invention disclosed in *Charnock* in order to effectively adapt to the changes in the interactions.

As per Claim 40 *Charnock* discloses a method for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions (fig 1). However, it does not explicitly state analyzing interactions.

McDonough, (col 12 lines 45-54), discloses the Quality Center analyzing the statistics and the customer feedback which are the interactions.

Therefore, from the teaching of *McDonough*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the step of analysis to the invention disclosed in *Charnock* to analyze the content of the interactions.

As per Claim 44, Examiner finds “is associated with a dispute” to be nonfunctional descriptive material not functionally involved in the steps recited. The step of analyzing the transaction and integrated transaction would be performed the same regardless what it was associated with. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from

the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

As per Claim 45, Examiner finds "provides for regulatory compliance or for quality management" to be nonfunctional descriptive material not functionally involved in the steps recited. The step of analyzing would be performed the same regardless of what the analysis provides for. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 21 USPQ 401,404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

As per Claim 47, *Charnock* discloses a method for the synchronization, integration and association of financially related captured interactions (fig 1) and being able to monitor in real time the content of interactions (col 6 lines 28-44). However, it does not explicitly state the step of monitoring in real-time and automatically scheduling interactions content to be monitored, analyzed and evaluated.

McDonough monitors in real-time (Col 6 lines 43-48) and automated said functions (*col 7 lines 41-42*).

Therefore, from the teaching of *McDonough*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to explicitly state the step of monitoring in real time and to automate the scheduling of the monitoring to the invention disclosed in *Charnock* to be able to respond effective and expediently to the content of the interaction.

As per Claim 51, (Currently Amended) *Charnock* in view of *McDonough* discloses the method of claim 33 wherein the at least one first interaction and the at least one second interaction are identified by a unique point-in-time based an interaction identifier. *(Col 6 lines 10-13 or other distinguishing mechanism where the "unique point-in-time" is non functional descriptive material)*

As per Claim 56, (New) *Charnock* in view of *McDonough* discloses the method of claim 33 (col 7 lines 35 and 36, where each occur on a screen, however Examiner finds "wherein the at least one first interaction or the at least one second interaction constitute screen events occurring on a screen used by a trader" to be nonfunctional descriptive material not functionally involved in the steps recited. The step capturing an interaction would be performed the same regardless of the type of interaction. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404, (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWANA SKINNER whose telephone number is (571)270-7141. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mooneyham Janice can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SHEWANA SKINNER/
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689